

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	San Luis Obispo Flood Control and Water Conservation District	Amount Requested	\$ 7,569,000
Proposal Title	San Luis Obispo Regional Integrated Water Management Proposal	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 22,498,130

PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposal includes seven projects with the following benefit types: water supply, water quality, ecosystem preservation and enhancement, and groundwater monitoring and management. Projects include: (1) Lake Nacimiento Water Treatment Plant, (2) Attiyeh Ranch Conservation Easement, (3) Livestock and Land Program, (4) Shandon State Water Turnout, (5) San Miguel Critical Water System Improvements, (6) San Simeon Supplemental Water Supply Feasibility Study and Design Project, and (7) IRWM Implementation Grant Administration.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	8/10
Budget	2/5		
Schedule	4/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	15/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	10/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			51

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and rationales are incomplete. The applicant describes project synergies as a tabulated overview, and project connections to the goals and objectives of the adopted IRWM plan. Maps of project locations are included. However the tasks are not all well described with respect to ensuring proper implementation. Some project deliverables, such as design plans, permits, and CEQA, are not included in the scope (for example Project 4). Task 11 (construction) assumes landowner participation. "Landowners will provide in-kind or cash match to implement the project as they are able. The budget assumes landowners will provide approximately 50% of the implementation site costs", a critical assumption. Very little of Project 5 is scoped. The construction task does not provide sufficient detail to implement the project.

BUDGET

The budgets for less than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information, many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. For projects 1, 2, and 3 the budgets are inconsistent with the scope, many of the table numbers don't match the included write up, and total project costs are not accurately reflected in the budgets. Certain tasks are not included in the total project cost column because they are not used as match or requesting grant funding, despite the requirement to present all project costs. Project 4 contains more scope description in the budget rather than the actual scope of work. Mileage and some other non-eligible costs are claimed for reimbursement or match by some projects. Some project write ups state that no grant funding is being used for a task, but the table shows grant funding for the task. Project 5 contains no back up documentation and is not consistent with the scope. Explanation of how costs were estimated is often limited, for example on p. 30 "based on similar projects".

SCHEDULE

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget. Construction will start before October 2014. The schedule for most of the projects seems reasonable and consistent with the scope of work. However the schedule for project 2 for obtaining the necessary additional grant funding is not described and is unknown.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The proposal included performance indicators, desired outcomes, targets, project goals, and measurement tools and methods for each project. However many performance measures and measurement tools and methods are vague. For example, performance measure monitoring for project 2 is photo monitoring points. If the photos show changes (significant changes not defined) potential "violations" (not well defined) are "addressed immediately with the landowner for resolution." Project 3 performance metrics are vague. For example, on page 19 a performance indicator of 30% reduction of pollutant loads is given but no water quality targets or measurement tool metrics are provided. Project 5 performance metrics are vague. For example, the outcome indicator "water always delivered in compliance with State drinking water standards" has no measurable water quality metrics other than "reports to CDPH".

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The proposal is technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but is either not fully supported by documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the projects or physical benefits are not well described. The physical benefits for Project 5 are vague. For example the table on page 95 shows an acre-feet per year measure of benefit but it is unclear how this figure was supported in the text. The technical support in the text for water quality improvement is unclear.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking. Projects 1 and 2 account for about 70 percent of funds requested and 90 percent of Net Present Value costs. Based on information provided, it is unclear whether these two projects are economical. The application includes some worthy projects, but the benefits analysis should be based on actual expected conditions without project, the types of benefits claimed should generally align with the purposes and problems that the projects intend to remedy, and physical water supply benefits of avoided development should clearly be based on net water savings, if any.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that six program preferences and five statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for nine of the Preferences claimed: (1) Include regional projects or programs; (2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (4) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Expand Environmental Stewardship; (8) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; and (9) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.